

development. But he wishes to describe the system in its complete form, especially as regards the service of the singers, and he does this under the reign of David, who was the father of Hebrew Psalmody, and the restorer of the sanctuary of the ark." As also in the same article "Chronicles," pp. 706b-707a:—"What seems to be certain and important for a right estimate of the book is that the author lived a considerable time after Ezra, and stood entirely under the influence of the religious institutions of the new theocracy. This standpoint determined the nature of his interest in the early history of his people. The true importance of Hebrew history had always centred in the fact that this petty nation was the people of Jehovah, the spiritual God. The tragic interest which distinguishes the annals of Israel from the forgotten history of Moab or Damascus lies wholly in that long contest which finally vindicated the reality of spiritual things and the supremacy of Jehovah's purpose, in the political ruin of the nation which was the faithless depository of these sacred truths. After the captivity it was impossible to write the history of Israel's fortunes otherwise than in a spirit of religious pragmatism. But within the limits of the religious conception of the plan and purpose of the Hebrew history more than one point of view might be taken up. The Book of Kings looks upon the history in the spirit of the Prophets:—in that spirit which is still echoed by Zechariah (i. 5-6): 'Your fathers, where are they? And the Prophets, could they live for ever! But my words and my statutes, which I commanded my servants the prophets, did they not overtake your fathers? so that they turned and said—'Like as Jehovah of Hosts thought to do unto us . . . so hath He dealt with us.' But long before the chronicler wrote, the last spark of prophecy was extinct. The new Jerusalem of Ezra was organized as a municipality and a Church, not as a nation. The centre of religious life was no longer the living prophetic word, but the ordinances of the Pentateuch and the liturgical service of the sanctuary. The religious vocation of Israel was no longer national but ecclesiastical or municipal, and the historical continuity of the nation was vividly realized only within the walls of Jerusalem and the courts of the Temple, in the solemn assembly and stately ceremonial of a feast day. These influences naturally operated most strongly on those who were officially attached to the sanctuary. To a Levite, even more than to other Jews, the history of Israel meant above all things the history of Jerusalem, of the Temple, and of the Temple ordinances. Now the author of Chronicles betrays on every page his essentially Levitical habit of mind. It even seems possible from a close attention to his descriptions of sacred ordinances to conclude that his special interests are those of a common Levite rather than of a priest, and that of all Levitical functions he is most partial to those of the singers, a member of whose guild Ewald conjectures him to have been. To such a man the older delineations of the history of Israel, especially in the books of Samuel and Kings, could not but appear to be deficient in some directions, while in other respects its narrative seemed superfluous or open to misunderstanding; as for example, by recording, and that without condemnation, things inconsistent with the Pentateuchal law. The history of the ordinances of worship holds a very small place in the older record. Jerusalem and the temple have not that central place in the Book of Kings which they occupied in the mind of the Jewish community after the exile. Large sections of the old history are devoted to the religion and politics of the ten tribes, which are altogether unintelligible and uninteresting when measured by a strictly Levitical standard; and in general the whole problems and struggles of the prophetic period turn on points which had ceased to be cardinal in the life of the new Jerusalem, which was no longer called to decide between the claims of the word of Jehovah and the exigencies of political affairs and social customs, and which could not comprehend that men absorbed in deeper spiritual contests had no leisure for the niceties of Levitical legislation. Thus there seemed to be room for a new history which should confine itself to matters still interesting to the theocracy of Zion, keeping Jerusalem and the temple in the foreground and developing the divine pragmatism of the history, not so much with reference to the prophetic word as to the fixed legislation of the Pentateuch, so that the whole narrative might be made to teach that the glory of Israel lies in the observance of the divine law and ritual." As also, in the same article, "Chronicles" p. 707b:—"In the later history, the ten tribes are quite neglected and political affairs in Judah received attention, not in proportion to their intrinsic importance, but according as they serve to exemplify God's help to the obedient and his chastisement of the rebellious. That the author is always unwilling to speak of the misfortunes of good rulers is not to be ascribed with some critics to a deliberate suppression of truths, but shows that the book was throughout composed not in purely historical interest, but with a view to inculcate a single practical lesson. The more important additions which the chronicler makes to the old narrative consist partly of statistical lists (1 Chron. xii.), partly of full details on points connected with the history of the sanctuary and the great feasts or the archaeology of the Levitical ministry . . . and partly of narratives of victories and defeats, of sins and punishments, of obedience and its rewards, which could be made to point a plain religious lesson in favour of the faithful observance of the law . . . The minor variations of Chronicles from the books of Samuel and Kings are analogous in principle to the larger additions and omissions, so that the whole work has a consistent and well-marked character, presenting the history in quite a different perspective from that of the old narrative. Here, then, a critical question arises—Is the change of perspective wholly due to a different selection of items from authentic historical tradition? May we assume that everything which is new in the Chronicles has been taken exactly from older sources, or must we judge that the standpoint of the author has not only governed the selection, but coloured the statement of historical facts? Are all his novelties new data, or are some of them inferences of his own from the same data as lie before us in other books of the Bible?"

"Quarto:—You, the said Mr. William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article 'Bible' p. 639b, wrote as follows, *videlicet*:—"In the book of Job we find poetical invention of

incidents, attached for didactic purposes to a name apparently derived from old tradition. There is no valid *a priori* reason for denying that the Old Testament may contain other examples of the same art. The book of Jonah is generally viewed as a case in point. Esther, too, has been viewed as a fiction by many who are not over-sceptical critics; but on this view a book which finds no recognition in the New Testament, and whose canonicity was long suspected by the Christian as well as by the Jewish church, must sink to the rank of an apocryphal production. In the poetical as in the historical books anonymous writing is the rule; and along with this we observe great freedom on the part of readers and copyists, who not only made verbal changes (c. f. Psalm xiv. with Psalm liii.), but composed new poems out of fragments of others (Psalm cviii. with lvii. and lx.). In a large part of the Psalter, a later hand has systematically substituted Elohim for Jehovah, and an imperfect acrostic like Ps. cix., x., cannot have proceeded in its present form from the first author. Still more remarkable is the case of the book of Job, in which the speeches of Elihu quite break the connection, and are almost universally assigned to a later hand." As also in the same article p. 640b:—"In this sketch of the prophetic writings we find no place for the book of Daniel, which, whether composed in the early years of the Persian Empire, or, as modern critics hold, at the time of the Maccabean wars, presents so many points of diversity from ordinary prophecy as to require entirely separate treatment. It is in point of form the precursor of the Apocalyptic books of post-canonical Judaism, though in its intrinsic qualities far superior to these, and akin to the Prophets proper." As also in the same article p. 635b. p. 636a:—"The miscellaneous character of the *Ketubim* (embracing Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles) seems in fact, to show that after the law and the prophets were closed, the third part of the canon was open to receive additions, recommended either by their religious and historical value, or by bearing an ancient and venerable name. And this was the more natural because the Hagiographa had not the same place in the synagogue service as was accorded to the law and the prophets."

"Quinto:—You the said Mr. William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article 'Canticles' p. 32b. wrote as follows, *videlicet*:—"To tradition again we owe the still powerful prejudice in favour of an allegorical interpretation; that is of the view that from verse to verse the song sets forth the history of a spiritual and not merely of an earthly love. To apply such an exegesis to Canticles is to violate the first principles of reasonable interpretation. True allegories are never without internal marks of their allegorical design. The language of symbol is not so perfect that a long chain of spiritual ideas can be developed without the use of a single spiritual word or phrase; and even were this possible, it would be false art in the allegorist to hide away his sacred thoughts behind a screen of sensuous and erotic imagery so complete and beautiful in itself as to give no suggestion that it is only the vehicle of a deeper sense. Apart from tradition, no one in the present state of exegesis could dream of allegorising poetry which in its natural sense is so full of purpose and meaning, so apt in sentiment, and so perfect in imagery as the lyrics of Canticles. We are not at liberty to seek for allegory, except where the natural sense is incomplete. This is not the case in the Song of Solomon. On the contrary, every form of the allegorical interpretation which has been devised carries its own condemnation in the fact that it takes away from the artistic unity of the poem and breaks natural sequences of thought. The allegorical interpretation of the Song of Solomon had its rise in the very same conditions which forced a deeper sense, now universally discarded, upon so many other parts of Scripture." As also in the same article, p. 35a:—"The heroine appears in the opening scene in a difficult and painful situation, from which in the last chapter, she is happily extricated. But the dramatic progress which the poem exhibits scarcely involves a plot in the usual sense of that word. The words of viii., 9, 10, clearly indicate that the deliverance of the heroine is due to no combination of favouring circumstances, but to her own inflexible fidelity and virtue. In accordance with this her *role* throughout the poem is simply a steadfast adherence to the position she takes up in the opening scene, where she is represented as concentrating her thoughts upon her absent lover, with all that stubborn force of will which is characteristic of the Hebrews, and as frustrating the advances of the king by the mere naive intensity of preoccupied affection." As also in the same article p. 35b:—"We learn that she was an inhabitant of Shulem or Shunem in Issachar, whom the king and his train surprised in a garden on the occasion of a royal progress through the north. Her beauty drew from the ladies of the court a cry of admiration." As also in the same article, p. 36b:—"A poem in the northern dialect, with a northern heroine and scenery, contrasting the pure simplicity of Galilee with the corrupt splendour of the court of Solomon, is clearly the embodiment of one phase of the feeling which separated the ten tribes from the house of David. The kingdom of Solomon was an innovation on old traditions, partly for good and partly for evil. But novelties of progress and novelties of corruption were alike distasteful to the north, which had long been proud of its loyalty to the principles of the good old times. The conservative revolution of Jeroboam was in great measure the work of the prophets, and must therefore have carried with it the religious and moral convictions of the people. An important element in these convictions, which still claims our fullest sympathy, is powerfully set forth in the Canticles, and the deletion of the book from the canon, providentially averted by the allegorical theory, would leave us without a most necessary complement to the Judean view of the conduct of the ten tribes, which we get in the historical books. Written in a spirit of protest against the court of Zion, and probably based on recollections of an actual occurrence, the poem cannot be dated long after the death of Solomon."

"Sexto:—You, the said Mr. William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article 'Bible,' p. 638b, wrote as follows, *videlicet*:—"The assertion that no Psalm is certainly David's is hypersceptical, and few remains of ancient literature have an authorship so well attested as the 18th or even as the 7th

Psalm. These, along with the indubitably Davidic poems in the book of Samuel, give a sufficiently clear image of a very unique genius, and make the ascription of several other poems to David extremely probable. So too a very strong argument claims Psalm ii. for Solomon, and in later times we have sure landmarks in the Psalms of Habbakuk (Hab. iii.) and Hezekiah (Isaiah xxxviii.) But the greater part of the lyrics of the Old Testament remain anonymous, and we can only group the Psalms in broad masses, distinguished by diversity of historical situation, and by varying degrees of freshness and personality. As a rule the older Psalms are the most personal, and are not written for the congregation but flow from a present necessity of individual (though not individualistic) spiritual life. This current of productive Psalmody runs apparently from David down to the exile, losing in the course of centuries something of its original freshness and fire, but gaining a more chastened pathos, and a wider range of spiritual sympathy. Psalm li., obviously composed during the desolation of the temple, marks, perhaps the last phase of this development." As also in the same article 'Bible,' as already quoted under heads 'Primo' and 'Secundo,' pp. . . . As also in the same article 'Bible,' p. 640b:—"In the period of Exile more than one anonymous prophet raised his voice, for not only the 'Great Unnamed' of Isaiah xl.-lxvi., but the authors of other Babylonian prophecies are probably to be assigned to this time."

"Septimo:—You, the said Mr. William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article—"The Question of Prophecy in the Critical Schools of the Continent," 'British Quarterly Review,' April 1870, p. 326, wrote as follows, *videlicet*:—"The prophets prophesied into the future, but not directly to the future. Their duties lay with their own age, and only by viewing them as they move amidst their contemporaries does the critic learn to love and to admire them." As also in the same article, p. 323:—"True prophecy is always ideal, seeking to grasp, not the immediate future, but the eternal and unchanging principle which Jehovah, the living God, is ever working out more fully among his people. The critical study of prophecy has done no greater service than to point out how small a fraction of the prophetic writings is strictly predictive." As also in the said article 'Bible,' p. 640:—"The prophecies contain—1st, reproof of present sins; 2nd, exhortation to present duty; 3rd, encouragement to the godly, and threatening to the wicked, based on the certainty of God's righteous purpose. In this last connection prophecy is predictive. It lays hold of the ideal elements of the theocratic conception, and depicts the way in which, by God's grace, they shall be actually realised in a Messianic age, and in a nation purified by judgment and mercy. But in all this the prophet starts from the present sin, present needs, present historical situations. There is no reason to think that a prophet ever received a revelation which was not spoken directly and pointedly to his own time." As also in article, 'The Sixteenth Psalm,' 'Expositor,' No. XXIII., Nov., 1876, p. 369:—"The Sixteenth Psalm delineates an ideal which throughout the Old Testament dispensation was never realised fully—that is, in a whole life—but which only expressed the highest climax of subjective conviction, was not felt to detract from its religious truth. Nay, in religion the ideal is the true. The destiny of him who is admitted into full fellowship with God is life, and if that fellowship has never yet been perfectly realised, it must be realised in time to come in the consummation of God's kingdom and righteousness. This, like other glorious promises of God, is deferred because of sin; but, though deferred, is not cancelled. Thus, the Psalm, originally an expression of direct personal persuasion, must necessarily, in its place in the Old Testament liturgy, have acquired a prophetic significance, and so must have been accepted as parallel to such highest anticipations of eschatological prophecy as Isaiah xxv. 8—"He hath swallowed up death forever." As also in the same article, p. 370:—"We may say, then, that in the mouth of the Psalmist himself our Psalm did not set forth a remote prophecy or a religious problem, but a truth of direct spiritual intuition. But accepted into the Old Testament liturgy as an expression of the faith of Israel, and so confronted with that experience of sin and imperfect communion with God of which the Old Testament was so sensible, it necessarily became part of a problem which runs through the whole dispensation, while at the same time it was a help towards the solution of the problem. Like other Psalms in which the ideal is developed in the teeth of the empirical, it came to possess a prophetic value for the Church, and it was felt to set forth truth only in so far as it was transferred from the present to the future." As also in same article, page 371:—"The Psalm is fulfilled in Christ, because in Christ the transcendental ideal of fellowship with God which the Psalm sets forth becomes a demonstrated reality. And becoming true of Christ, the Psalm is also true of all who are His and in the Psalmist's claim to use it for himself the soundness of his religious insight is vindicated: for Christ faced death not only for Himself, but as our surety and head."

"Octavo:—You, the said Mr. William Robertson Smith, in the aforesaid article 'Angel,' page 27a., wrote as follows, *videlicet*:—"It is indeed certain—to pass to the second side of the doctrine—that the angelic figures of the Bible narrative are not mere allegories of divine providence, but were regarded as possessing a certain super-human reality. But this reality is matter of assumption rather than of direct teaching. Nowhere do we find a clear statement as to the creation of the angels (Gen. ii. is ambiguous, and it is scarcely legitimate in Psalm cxlviii. to connect ver. 2 with ver. 5). That they are endowed with special goodness and insight analogous to human qualities appears as a popular assumption, not as a doctrine of revelation (1 Sam. xxix. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 17, xix. 27)." As also in the same article, page 28a:—"The angelology of the New Testament attaches closely to the notion already developed." As also in the same article, page 26b:—"The angelophany is a theophany as direct as is possible to man. The idea of a full representation of God to man, in all his revealed character, by means of an angel, comes out most clearly for the angel that leads Israel in the very old passage, Exodus-xxiii. 20, ff. This angel is sent before the people to keep them in the way and bring them